



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,595	02/06/2002	Van Miller	6164-47	5448

23477 7590 06/10/2004

MARKS & CLERK  
1075 NORTH SERVICE ROAD WEST  
SUITE 203  
OAKVILLE, ON L6M 2G2  
CANADA

EXAMINER

SORKIN, DAVID L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1723

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/066,595

Applicant(s)

MILLER ET AL.

Examiner

David L. Sorkin

Art Unit

1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 14-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 12 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray (US 4,068,830). Note regarding the interpretation of the instant claims:

- a. The instant claims make reference to materials intended to be acted upon by the claimed mixer during an intended operation, such as "color syrup additive" and "tempered, lipid-based formulation". However, "expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim[s]" *Ex parte Thilbault*, 164 USPQ 666,667 (Bd. App. 1969). Likewise, "[i]nclusion of material or article worked upon by a structure being claimed does not impart patentability to the claims" *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

- b. The instant claims recite several intended uses or operations of the mixer or parts thereof, such as operating the pump cyclically, feeding material in a continuous stream; and feeding material in discrete spaced apart quantities; however, "the manner or method in which such machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself" *In re Casey* 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967). Also, "recitation with respect to the manner in which

Art Unit: 1723

the claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" *Ex parte Masham* 2 USPQ 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Regarding claim 12, Gary ('830) discloses an apparatus comprising a storage tank (see col. 4, line 20); a mixing body (10,12,15) for evenly mixing to form a mixture, said mixing body having an outlet tube (10b) for said mixture; a feed tube (10a) couple to said storage tank for feeding formulation into said mixing body in a continuous stream; a reservoir (see col. 4, line 26) for additive; an injection port (11a) located at a position within the interior of said feed tube so as to be surrounded by said formulation as it flows into said mixing body. It is not explicitly stated that a pump is connect to the reservoir. However, it is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided a pump for the reservoir because of the express suggestion in col. 2 lines 3-4 that a pump is an alternative source of pressure for causing fluid flow. The reference does not disclose some of the acts recited in claim 12, such as operating the pump cyclically and locating discrete quantities of color syrup additive in a continuous stream of lipid based formulation; however, as explained above, apparatus claims do not cover acts, but instead cover structure. The claim is clearly directed to the machine statutory category of invention, and is not a method claim nor a improper *Ex parte Lyell* 17 USPQ2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) type hybrid machine/method claim. A reference need not disclose or render obvious acts discussed in a machine claim to anticipate or render obvious the claim. Regarding claim 14, the mixing body is a jacketed ribbon blender (see Fig. 1). Regarding claim 15, the

quantitative values for flow rate in Table III would have suggested a proportional pump to one of ordinary skill in the art. Regarding claim 16, said injection port is centrally located within said feeding tube (see Fig. 1).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claim 13 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The closest prior art, Gray (US 4,068,830), does not disclose or suggest "a plurality of fingers directed radially inwardly from the circumference thereof, and a plurality of interposed circular discs each having a diameter less than the diameter of the mixing body mounted axially along the length of the mixing body", in combination with the limitations of the base claim.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments are moot because of the new grounds for rejection.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 1723

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David L. Sorkin whose telephone number is 571-272-1148. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 -5:30 Mon.-Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L. Walker can be reached on 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



David L. Sorkin  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1723

David Sorkin